SUPREME COURT MINUTES THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S126550 C043594 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. COTTLE (KEVIN L.)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed and remand this matter for proceedings consistent with this opinion. Majority Opinion by Corrigan, J.,

---- Joined by George, CJ., Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin and Moreno, JJ.

S126715 B152759 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

SOUKUP (PEGGY J.) v. HAFIF, LAW OFFICES OF

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed and remand to the Court of Appeal for further proceedings. Majority opinion by Moreno, J.

----Joined by George, C.J., Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin, Corrigan, JJ.

S126864 B154311 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

SOUKUP (PEGGY J.) v. STOCK (RONALD S.)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed and remand to the Court of Appeal for further proceedings. Majority opinion by Moreno, J.

---joined by George, C.J., Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin, Corrigan, JJ.

S128429 B171570 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

FLATLEY (MICHAEL) v. MAURO

(D. DEAN)

Opinion filed: Judgment affirmed in full.

Opinion by Moreno, J.

----joined by George, C.J., Kennard, Baxter, Chin & Corrigan, JJ.

Concurring Opinion by Werdegar, J.

S075725

PEOPLE v. JONES (KIONGOZI)

Extension of time granted to September 29, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only six further extensions totaling 360 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S136708

WADE (TOBY T.) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted to August 13, 2006, to file petitioner's response to the Attorney General's informal response.

S142342 G035329 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

FOULKES (JANE P.) v. QUEST SOFTWARE

The order filed on July 11, 2006, amending the court of appeal number, is hereby amended to read the court of appeal number reflected above.

S145012

PEOPLE v. EDWARDS (TERRENCE E.)

Transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior* Court (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.